USA v. Murdaugh Criminal No. 9:23-cr-00396-RMG Defendant's Motion for Immediate Seizure of Defendant's Assets

EXHIBIT A

(Transcript excerpt from May 3, 2023 hearing, Beach v. Parker, et al.)

```
1
    STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA )
                                    COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
                                       2019-CP-25-00111
 2
    COUNTY
            OF
                LEXINGTON
 3
 4
    RENEE BEACH, personal
 5
    representative of the
    estate of Mallory Beach,
 6
                   Plaintiff,
7
                                      TRANSCRIPT OF RECORD
 8
    VS.
 9
    GREG M. PARKER, INC., and
    RICHARD A. MURDAUGH, and
10
    RICHARD A. MURDAUGH, JR.,
11
                  Defendants.
                                )
12
13
                        May 3, 2023
14
                         Lexington, South Carolina
15
    BEFORE:
16
         HONORABLE DANIEL D. HALL, JUDGE
17
    APPEARANCES:
18
         James M. Griffin, Esquire
19
         Jordan Crapps, Esquire
20
         John T. Lay, Esquire
21
         Eric S. Bland, Esquire
22
         Mark B. Tinsley, Esquire
23
24
                                        Lisa G. Amick
                                        Official Court Reporter
25
```

9:2\(\beta\)-cr-00396-RMG Date Filed 09/25/23 Entry Number 43-1 Page 2 of 3

1

attorney in criminal court, or if they can't afford an attorney, the Court would appoint an attorney. So it seems like the issue becomes in this particular case almost an equitable issue of who pays, either the tax payers through indigent defense or either money that legally and technically right now is still his and should pay his, the Court approved payment of that money so that, I mean, is that sort of where we are practically, who pays? Either it comes out of his, either comes out of that bucket, and I'll hear from everybody in just a moment, we're going to take our time on this, and I'm not going to rule today, but that's sort of where I am, how I view it. Yes, Mr. Crapps?

MR. CRAPPS: Well, so a couple things. In that US v Marshall case, the issue at hand was the restraint of untainted assets and whether those assets can be used to hire appellate counsel. When addressed with that question, the Fourth Circuit said no, they answered that question in the negative. So, so that comment between tainted and untainted I think is a little misleading, especially when the Sixth Amendment provides no right to this relief that they seek. Also, Your Honor, the, the tainted issue is kind of the statutory mechanism that Courts in these series of cases we've been talking about today uses to transfer title or interest from that Defendant to the government. And so here, that transfer of interest, the government's interest, we're not the government, I'll get to